arXiv:1704.07520v1 [stat.ML] 25 Apr 2017

Stein Variational Gradient Descent as Gradient Flow

Qiang Liu [1]

Abstract

Stein variational gradient descent (SVGD) is a deterministic sampling algorithm that iteratively transports a set of particles to approximate given distributions, based on an efficient gradient-based update that guarantees to optimally decrease the KL divergence within a function space. This paper develops the first theoretical analysis on SVGD, discussing its weak convergence properties and showing that its asymptotic behavior is captured by a gradient flow of the KL divergence functional under a new metric structure induced by Stein operator. We also provide a number of results on Stein operator and Stein's identity using the notion of weak derivative, including a new proof of the distinguishability of Stein discrepancy under weak conditions.

1. Introduction

Stein variational gradient descent (SVGD) (Liu & Wang, 2016) is a particle-based algorithm for approximating complex distributions. Unlike typical Monte Carlo algorithms that rely on randomness for approximation, SVGD constructs a set of points (or particles) by iteratively applying *deterministic* updates that is constructed to optimally decrease the KL divergence to the target distribution at each iteration. SVGD has a simple form that efficient leverages the gradient information of the distribution, and can be readily applied to complex models with massive datasets for which typical gradient descent has been found efficient. A nice property of SVGD is that it strictly reduces to the typical gradient ascent for maximum a posteriori (MAP) when using only a single particle ($n = 1$), while turns into a full sampling method with more particles. This makes SVGD more *particle-efficient* than typical Monte Carlo methods that often require much larger numbers of particles and are not fully optimized to leverage the power of the particles due their random nature.

SVGD can be viewed as a variational inference algorithm (e.g., Wainwright et al., 2008), but is significantly different from the typical *parametric* variational inference algorithms that use parametric sets to approximate given distributions and have the disadvantage of introducing deterministic biases and (often) requiring non-convex optimization. The non-parametric nature of SVGD allows it to provide consistent estimation for generic distributions like Monte Carlo does. There are also particle algorithms based on optimization, or variational principles, with theoretical guarantees (e.g., Chen et al., 2012; Dick et al., 2013; Dai et al., 2016), but they often do not use the gradient information effectively and do not scale well in high dimensions.

However, SVGD is difficult to analyze theoretically because it involves a system of particles that interact with each other in complex ways. In this work, we take an initial step towards analyzing SVGD. We characterize the SVGD dynamics using an evolutionary process of the empirical measures of the particles and establish their weak convergence to the given target distribution. We show that the asymptotic limit of SVGD can be viewed as a gradient flow of KL divergence, defined on a new Riemannian-like metric structure imposed the space of density functions. In addition, as a side result, we develop a number of key results on Stein operator using the notion of weak differentiability, including a proof of the distinguishability of Stein discrepancy under weaker conditions than existing ones.

2. Stein Variational Gradient Descent (SVGD)

We start with a brief overview of SVGD. Let ν_p be a probability measure of interest with a positive, (weakly) differentiable density $p(x)$ on $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We want to approximate ν_p with a set of particles $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ whose empirical measure $\mu_n(\mathrm{d}x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x - x_i)/n\mathrm{d}x$ weakly converges to ν_p as $n \to \infty$ (denoted by $\mu_n \Rightarrow \nu_p$), in the sense that we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_n}[h] \to \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p}[h]$ as $n \to \infty$ for all bounded, continuous test functions h.

To achieve this, we initialize the particles with some simple distribution μ, and update them via map

$$\boldsymbol{T}(x) = x + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\phi}(x),$$

where ϵ is a small step size, and $\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)$ is a perturbation direction, or velocity field, which, ideally, should be chosen to maximally decrease the KL divergence of the particle

[1]Dartmouth College, Hanover, USA. Correspondence to: Qiang Liu <qiang.liu@dartmouth.edu>.

distribution with the target distribution; this can be framed as solving the following functional optimization,

$$\max_{\phi\in\mathcal{H}}\left\{-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon}\mathrm{KL}(\boldsymbol{T}\mu\,||\,\nu_p)\big|_{\epsilon=0}\;\; s.t.\;\; ||\phi||_{\mathcal{H}}\le 1\right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{T}\mu$ denotes the pushforward measure of μ through map $\boldsymbol{T}$, that is, the distribution of $z=\boldsymbol{T}(x)$ when $x\sim\mu$, and $\mathcal{H}$ is a normed function space chosen to optimize over.

A key observation is that the objective in (1) is a linear functional of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ that draws connections to ideas in the Stein's method (Stein, 1986) for proving limit theorems or probabilistic bounds. Liu & Wang (2016) showed that

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon}\mathrm{KL}(\boldsymbol{T}\mu\,||\,\nu_p)\big|_{\epsilon=0}=\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}], \quad (2)$$

$$\text{where}\quad \mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)=\nabla\log p(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)+\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}(x). \quad (3)$$

Here $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}=\sum_{k=1}^d\partial_{x_k}\phi_k(x)$ denotes the typical divergence operator, and $\mathcal{T}_p$ is a linear operator that maps a vector-valued function $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ to a scalar-valued function $\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}$, and is called the *Stein operator* in connection with the so called *Stein's identity*, which shows that the RHS of (2) equals zero if $\mu=\nu_p$:

$$\mathbb{E}_p[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}]=\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla\log p^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}+\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}]=0. \quad (4)$$

Stein's identity can be established by integration by parts assuming the value of $p(x)\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)$ vanishes on the boundary of the integration domain, or using weak derivative as we elaborate in Section 3.

Therefore, the optimization (1) reduces to

$$\mathbb{D}(\mu\,||\,\nu_p)\coloneqq\max_{\boldsymbol{\phi}\in\mathcal{H}}\left\{\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}],\quad s.t.\quad ||\boldsymbol{\phi}||_{\mathcal{H}}\le 1\right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{D}(\mu\,||\,\nu_p)$ is called Stein discrepancy between μ and ν_p. Because (5) induces an infinite dimensional functional optimization, it is critical to select a nice space $\mathcal{H}$ to ensure computational tractability in practice. Kernelized Stein discrepancy (KSD) provides one way to achieve this by taking $\mathcal{H}$ to be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), for which the optimization yields a closed form solution. (Liu et al., 2016; Chwialkowski et al., 2016; Oates et al., 2017). See also Gorham & Mackey (2015); Gorham et al. (2016) for other variants of computable Stein discrepancies.

To introduce KSD, let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be a RKHS of scalar-valued functions with positive definite kernel $k(x,x')$, and $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_0\times\cdots\times\mathcal{H}_0$ its corresponding $d\times 1$ vector-valued RKHS. Then it can be shown that the optimal solution of (5) is

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu,p}(\cdot)\propto\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu}[\mathcal{T}_p\otimes k(x,\cdot)], \quad (6)$$

where $k(x,x')$ is the positive definite kernel related to $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{T}_p\otimes k(x,\cdot)\coloneqq\nabla\log p(x)k(x,\cdot)+\nabla_x k(x,\cdot)$, which maps a scalar-valued function to a vector-valued one. Further, we can show that

$$\mathbb{D}(\mu\,||\,\nu_p)=||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu,p}||=\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x,x'\sim\mu}[\kappa_p(x,x')]},$$
$$\text{with}\quad \kappa_p(x,x')=\mathcal{T}_p^x\mathcal{T}_p^{x'}\otimes k(x,x'), \quad (7)$$

where $\kappa_p(x,x')$ is a "Steinalized" positive definite kernel obtained by applying Stein operator twice; $\mathcal{T}_p^x$ and $\mathcal{T}_p^{x'}$ are the Stein operator w.r.t. variable x and x', respectively. The key advantage of KSD is its computational tractability: it can be empirically evaluated with samples drawn from μ and the gradient $\nabla\log p$, which is independent of the normalization constant in p.

In SVGD, we are given a set of particles $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ whose distribution μ may be unknown to us; in this case the distributional information of the particles is best represented by its empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$, and it is natural to think that $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\hat{\mu}_n,p}$, with μ in (6) replaced by the empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$, provides the best update for moving the particles (and $\hat{\mu}_n$) "closer to" ν_p. By implementing this update iteratively, we get the main SVGD algorithm:

$$x^i_{\ell+1}\leftarrow x^i_\ell+\epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\hat{\mu}^n_\ell,p}(x^i_\ell)\;\;\forall i=1,\dots,n, \quad (8)$$
$$\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\hat{\mu}^n_\ell,p}(x)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\nabla\log p(x^j_\ell)k(x^j_\ell,x)+\nabla_{x^j_\ell}k(x^j_\ell,x)],$$

where $\{x^i_\ell\}_{i=1}^n$ denotes the particles at the ℓ-th iteration of the algorithm, and $\hat{\mu}^n_\ell$ is their empirical measure. This process is repeated starting from some initial particles until convergence. Intuitively speaking, this update pushes the particles towards the high probability regions of the target probability via the gradient term $\nabla\log p$, while maintaining a degree of diversity via the second term $\nabla k(x,x_i)$. In addition, (8) reduces to the typical gradient descent for maximizing $\log p$ if we use only a single particle ($n=1$) and the kernel stratifies $\nabla k(x,x')=0$ for $x=x'$; this allows SVGD to provide a spectrum of approximation that smooths between maximum a posterior (MAP) to a full sampling approximation by using different particle sizes.

Algorithm 1 Stein Variational Gradient Descent (Liu & Wang, 2016)

Input: The score function $\nabla_x\log p(x)$.
Goal: A set of particles $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ that approximates $p(x)$.
Initialize a set of particles $\{x^i_0\}_{i=1}^n$; pick a positive definite kernel $k(x,x')$ and step-size scheme $\{\epsilon_\ell\}$.
for iteration ℓ **do**
$x^i_{\ell+1}\leftarrow x^i_\ell+\epsilon_\ell\boldsymbol{\phi}(x^i_\ell)$
$$\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\left[k(x^j_\ell,x)\nabla_{x^j_\ell}\log p(x^j_\ell)+\nabla_{x^j_\ell}k(x^j_\ell,x)\right].$$
end for

In SVGD, the empirical particle measure $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ is iteratively updated in order to minimize $\mathrm{KL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \,||\, \nu_p)$. A crucial but subtle point here is that although $\mathrm{KL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \,||\, \nu_p)$ is technically infinite (or undefined) because the empirical delta measure $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ is not absolutely continuous w.r.t. ν_p (and exists no density function), it is still valid to talk about its gradient according to (2) and its steepest descent direction $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\hat{\mu}_\ell^n,p}$, both of which are finite and well defined for $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$. An approach to resolve this conflict is to consider the relative improvement compared with the initial empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ as the objective:

$$\mathrm{KL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\hat{\mu}_0^n \,||\, \nu_p), \tag{9}$$

which is finite according to the path integration of the gradients in (2). Note that another scenario when we need to minimize "infinite" KL divergence appears in maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) which we are interested in finding an optimal ν_p to fit the empirical measure of observed data. But our case is conceptually more involved since it is clear in the case of MLE that minimizing the KL divergence is equivalent to minimizing the cross entropy (dropping the entropy term), while in our case the entropy term plays an important role of enforcing the diversity of the particles and the quantity in (9) only makes sense when considering the transform trajectory from $\hat{\mu}_0^n$ to $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$.

Another point to note is that the SVGD update in (8) does not correspond to minimizing any objective function $F(\{x_\ell^i\})$ in terms of the particle location $\{x_\ell^i\}$, because one would find $\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}F \neq \partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i}F$ if this is true. Instead, it is best to view SVGD as a type of (particle-based) numerical approximation for an evolutionary partial differential equation (PDE) of densities or measures, which corresponds to a special type of gradient flow of the KL divergence functional whose equilibrium state equals the given target distribution ν_p. We discussion this in Section 4.

3. Stein Operator and Weak Derivative

Before introducing our main result on SVGD, we discuss some extra results on Stein operator that form the foundation of Stein-related computation methods in general. The main contribution of this section is two fold:

1. We introduce Stein operator using the notion of weak differentiability, which is naturally related to integration by parts and Stein's identity by definition. In fact, Stein's original work (Stein, 1981) used a notion of "almost differentiablity" that is later shown to be equivalent to weak differentiability (Johnstone, 1988). The use of weak differentiability allows us to establish results with significantly weaker conditions and extend to non-smooth models such as these includes L^1 norm or rectified linear units (ReLU).

2. Based on the framework of weak differentiability, we study the richness of the images of Stein operator under generic function spaces $\mathcal{H}$, and use it to establish the key result of $\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) = 0 \iff \mu = \nu_p$ under weaker conditions than existing ones (see Section 3.2). This result provides a foundation for proving the weak convergence of SVGD in Section 4, as well as the consistency of goodness-of-fit tests based on Stein discrepancy.

3.1. Stein's Identity via Weak Derivative

A function $f\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ is first order weak differentiable (denoted by $f \in W^1$) if it is locally integrable[1] and there exists a $d \times 1$ vector-valued locally integrable function $\boldsymbol{\rho}\colon X \to \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$\int_X h(x)\boldsymbol{\rho}(x)dx = -\int_X f(x)\nabla h(x)dx, \quad \forall\ h \in C_c^\infty,$$

where C_c^∞ denotes the set of infinitely differentiable functions with compact supports. $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is called the weak derivative of f, and we denote it by $\nabla f = \boldsymbol{\rho}$. Let L^∞ be the set of bounded function on X. For $f, g \in W^1 \cap L^\infty$, we have $fg \in W^1 \cap L^\infty$ and the *product rule*: $\nabla(fg) = g\nabla f + f\nabla g$ (Proposition D.7, Hundertmark et al., 2013).

Definition 3.1. *Let p be a weakly differentiable, positive density function on X. Stein operator is defined to be*

$$\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} = \frac{\nabla \cdot (p\boldsymbol{\phi})}{p},$$

which acts on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ that satisfies $p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in W^1$. Further, let $\nabla \log p = p^{-1}\nabla p$ and assume the product rule holds, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} = \nabla \log p^\top \boldsymbol{\phi} + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}.$$

Since $p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in W^1$, the definition of weak derivative gives

$$\mathbb{E}_p[h\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}] = -\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}], \quad \forall h \in C_c^\infty.$$

where test functions h are in C_c^∞. Note that Stein's identity (4) is the special case when $h = 1$, which, unfortunately, is not included in C_c^∞. Therefore, we need to expand the set of test functions by applying stronger conditions on p; this invites the introduction of Sobolev space.

Denote by L_p^2 the typical p-weighted L2 Hilbert space with inner product $\langle f,\ g\rangle_{L_p^2} = \mathbb{E}_p[fg]$. Let $W_{2,p}^1$ be the p-weighted Sobolev space equipped with inner product

$$\langle f,\ g\rangle_{W_{2,p}^1} = \langle f, g\rangle_{L_p^2} + \langle \nabla f,\ \nabla g\rangle_{(L_p^2)^d},$$

and $W_{2,p}^1$ consists of functions with $||f||_{W_{2,p}^1} < \infty$. Let $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$ be the closure of C_c^∞ in $W_{2,p}^1$ under norm $||\cdot||_{W_{2,p}^1}$, and $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$ is called a restricted Sobolev space. Obviously, we have $C_c^\infty \subseteq \mathring{W}_{2,p}^1 \subseteq W_{2,p}^1 \subseteq L_p^2$. However, it can be shown that $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1 = W_{2,p}^1$ if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$.

[1] A function is locally integrable ($f \in L_{loc}^1$) on X if it is integrable for all compact subsets on X.

Lemma 3.2. *(1) Assume $p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (W^1)^d$, $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (L_p^2)^d$ and $\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in L_p^2$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_p[h\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}] = -\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}], \quad \forall h \in \mathring{W}_{2,p}^1.$$

(2) Further, if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1 = W_{2,p}^1$, which includes $h = 1$ and hence

$$\mathbb{E}_p[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}] = 0, \qquad \textit{(Stein's identity)}.$$

Remark *The condition in Lemma 3.2 (1) can be replaced by $p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (W^1)^d$, $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (W_{2,p}^1)^d$ and $\mathbb{E}_p||\nabla \log p||_2^2 < \infty$.*

3.2. Richness of Steinalized Spaces

Define $\mathcal{H}_p$ to be the image of Stein operator $\mathcal{T}_p$ on $\mathcal{H}$, that is, $\mathcal{H}_p = \{\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} : \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}\}$. In case when $\mathcal{H}$ is a RKHS with kernel $k(x, x')$, $\mathcal{H}_p$ also forms a RKHS with the Steinalized kernel $\kappa_p(x, x')$ as defined in (7). From Stein's identity, all the functions in $\mathcal{H}_p$ have zero expectation under ν_p. We define $\mathcal{H}_p^+ = \mathcal{H}_p \oplus \mathbb{R}$ (the direct sum of two RKHS) to be the set of functions of form $\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} + b$, where $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. We can then rewrite the KSD in (5) into a maximum mean discrepancy over $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ (or $\mathcal{H}_p$):

$$\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) = \max_{q \in \mathcal{H}_p^+} \{\mathbb{E}_\mu f - \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f, \quad s.t. \quad ||\boldsymbol{\phi}||_{\mathcal{H}_p^+} \le 1\}.$$

Therefore, the richness of $\mathcal{H}_p$ determines the discriminative power of Stein discrepancy. In particular, one critical question is what condition is needed on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{T}_p$ to ensure that $\mathcal{H}_p$ is rich enough to guarantee that

$$\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) = 0 \iff \mu = \nu_p, \qquad \text{for any } \mu. \tag{10}$$

This problem has been discussed by Liu et al. (2016); Chwialkowski et al. (2016), both of which, however, require to assume that μ has to have a nice density function with well defined Stein operator, and can not eliminate the case when there exists some badly behaved μ that makes $\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) = 0$. Since μ is often assumed to be some unknown distribution of observed data, or in the case of SVGD, obtained by simulating a dynamic system, it is hard to guarantee nice conditions on it. Oates et al. (2016) also studied the same problem and provided results that requires no conditions on μ, but focusing on the case when X is assumed to be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Here we establish a more general result for $X = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ on which $q(x)$ is a positive probability density function, and $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear subspace of $(L_p^2)^d$. If $\mathcal{H}$ (or a subset of it) satisfies*

1. *For $\forall\, \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$, $p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (W^1)^d$;*
2. *$\mathcal{H}_p^+ \subseteq \mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$;*
3. *$\mathcal{H} \cap (C_c^\infty)^d$ is dense in $(C_c^\infty)^d$ under $||\cdot||_{L_p^2}$ norm,*

then $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is dense in L_p^2 under the $||\cdot||_{L_p^2}$ norm. Further, if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, Condition 2 can be replaced by $\mathcal{H}_p^+ \subseteq W_{2,p}^1$ which is easier to verify in practice.

Here Condition 3 is a straightforward requirement that ensures that the "input space" $\mathcal{H}$ has to be rich enough. Condition 2 requires that all the functions $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ are mapped into $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$ through $\mathcal{T}_p$, and hence is "useful" in approximating functions in $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$ (and hence L_p^2). Obviously, the result holds true if we can find a C_c^∞-dense subset of $\mathcal{H}$ that maps into $\mathring{W}_{2,p}^1$. Lemma 4 of Oates et al. (2016) establishes a similar density result of $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ in L_p^2 for compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the typical notion of differentiability.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is dense in L_p^2 as established in Theorem 3.3. In addition, assume all the functions in $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ are bounded and continuous and $p(x)$ is positive everywhere. Then for any probabilistic measure μ, we have $\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) = 0$ if and only if $\mu = \nu_p$.*

The condition that $p(x)$ is positive everywhere plays a crucial role here, since the L_p^2 norm can not control functions in the regions where ν_p assign zero measure. For example, assume there exists an open set A with $\nu_p(A) = 0$, then we can set $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{1}{2}(p(x) + \mathbb{I}(x \in A)/\mathrm{vol}(A))\mathrm{d}x$ and Stein discrepancy can not distinguish μ from ν_p.

4. Density Evolution of SVGD Dynamics

In this section, we characterize the evolutionary process of the empirical measures $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ of the SVGD particles and their large sample and large time limits, and discuss the weak convergence of $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ to the target measure ν_p as $n \to \infty$ and $\ell \to \infty$. Further, we show that the large sample limit of the SVGD dynamics monotonically decreases the KL divergence between the particle and target distributions, with a decreasing rate that equals the square of Stein discrepancy. We also establish a geometric intuition that interpret SVGD as a gradient flow of KL divergence under a new Riemannian metric structure induced by Stein operator.

Let $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) = x + \boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mu,p}^*(x)$ with $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*$ defined in (6). Consider map $\Phi_p : \mu \mapsto \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}\mu$, where $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}\mu$ denotes the push-forward measure of μ through transform $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}$. This map fully characterizes the SVGD dynamics in the sense that the empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ can be obtained by recursively applying Φ_p starting from the initial measure $\hat{\mu}_0^n$.

$$\hat{\mu}_{\ell+1}^n = \Phi_p(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n), \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{11}$$

Note that Φ_p is a nonlinear map because $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}$ also depends on the input map μ. If μ has a density q and ϵ is small enough so that $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}$ is invertible, the density q' of $\Phi_p(\mu)$ is given by the change of variables formula:

$$q'(z) = q(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}^{-1}(z))\det(\nabla \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}^{-1}(z)). \tag{12}$$

When μ is an empirical measure and q is a Dirac delta function, this equation still holds formally in the sense of distribution (generalized functions).

Critically, Φ_p also fully characterizes the large sample limit property of SVGD. Assume the initial empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_0^n$ at the 0-th iteration weakly converges to a measure μ_0^∞ as $n \to \infty$, which can be achieved, for example, by drawing $\{x_0^i\}$ i.i.d. from μ_0^∞, or using MCMC or Quasi Monte Carlo methods. Starting from the limit initial measure μ_0^∞ and applying Φ_p recursively, we get

$$\mu_{\ell+1}^\infty = \Phi_p(\mu_\ell^\infty), \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{13}$$

Since $\hat{\mu}_0^n \Rightarrow \mu_0^\infty$ according to the initialization, we may expect that $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \Rightarrow \mu_\ell^\infty$ for all the iterations ℓ if Φ_p satisfies certain Lipschitz condition. This is naturally captured by the bounded Lipschitz metric.

For two measures μ and ν, their bounded Lipschitz metric is defined to be their difference of means on the set of bounded, Lipschitz functions:

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mu,\ \nu) = \sup_f \big\{ \mathbb{E}_\mu f - \mathbb{E}_\nu f \quad s.t. \quad ||f||_{\mathrm{BL}} \le 1 \big\},$$

where $||f||_{\mathrm{BL}} = \max\Big\{ \sup_x |f(x)|,\ \sup_{x \neq y} \dfrac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{||x-y||_2} \Big\}$.

For a vector-valued bounded Lipschitz function $\boldsymbol{f} = [f_1, \ldots, f_d]$, we define its norm by $||\boldsymbol{f}||_{\mathrm{BL}}^2 = \sum_i ||f_i||_{\mathrm{BL}}^2$. It is known that the BL metric metricizes weak convergence, that is, $\mathrm{BL}(\mu_n,\ \nu) \to 0$ if and only if $\mu_n \Rightarrow \nu$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $\boldsymbol{g}(x,y) := \mathcal{A}_p^x k(x,y)$ is bounded Lipschitz jointly on (x,y) with norm $||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathrm{BL}} < \infty$, then*

$$\mathrm{BL}(\Phi_p(\mu) - \Phi_p(\mu')) \le (1 + 2\epsilon||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathrm{BL}})\ \mathrm{BL}(\mu,\ \mu'),$$

for any two probability measures μ and μ'.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n$ be the empirical measure of $\{x_\ell^i\}_{i=1}^n$ at the ℓ-th iteration of SVGD. Assume*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_0^n,\ \mu_0^\infty) \to 0,$$

then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n,\ \mu_\ell^\infty) \to 0,$$

at any finite iteration ℓ; here μ_ℓ^∞ is obtained by applying Φ_p on μ_0^∞ recursively for ℓ times as defined in (13).

Proof. It is a direct result of Lemma 4.1. □

Since $\mathrm{BL}(\mu,\ \nu)$ metricizes weak convergence, our result suggests $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}_\ell^\infty$ for $\forall \ell$, if $\hat{\mu}_0^n \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}_0^\infty$ by initialization.

From Lemma 4.1 the convergence speed of $\mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n,\ \mu_\ell^\infty$ depends on the convergence speed of the initial $\mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_0^n,\ \mu_0^\infty)$. For example, standard results in concentration of measure ensures that $\mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_0^n,\ \mu_0^\infty) = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ with high probability when μ_0^∞ is log-concave and we initialize the particles with i.i.d. draws from μ_0^∞. In this case, we can guarantee that $\mathrm{BL}(\hat{\mu}_\ell^n,\ \mu_\ell^\infty) = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ as well by Lemma 4.1. Note that it is necessary to require μ_0^∞ to be log-concave in order to get an $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ rate, because BL is a rather strong metric. Fortunately this is not a significant constraint since the initial distribution μ_0^∞ can be chosen freely by the users.

4.1. Large Time Asymptotics of Φ_p

It is now enough to consider the limit process (13) starting from μ_0^∞, which we can assume to have nice density functions and have finite KL divergence with the target ν_p. We show that the evolutionary process (13) of μ_ℓ^∞ monotonically decreases the KL divergence with ν_p and hence converges to ν_p.

Theorem 4.3. *1. Assume p is a density that satisfies Stein's identity (4) for $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{H}$, then the measure ν_p of p is a fixed point of Φ_p.*

2. Assume $M = ||\nabla \log p||_{\mathrm{Lip}} \sup_x k(x,x) < \infty$ and take the step-size ϵ to be smaller than $\frac{1}{M}$. Assume $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_0^\infty \,||\, \nu_p) < \infty$, then

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu_{\ell+1}^\infty \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell^\infty \,||\, \nu_p) \le -\frac{\epsilon}{2}\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell^\infty \,||\, \nu_p)^2.$$

Therefore, if $\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell^\infty \,||\, \nu_p) = 0 \iff \mu_\ell^\infty = \nu_p$ (Theorem 3.4) then μ_p is the unique fixed point of Φ_p.

Remark *Theorem 4.3 does not apply to the case when μ_0^∞ is an empirical measure (with point mass), since it would give $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_0^\infty \,||\, \nu_p) = \infty$ in the beginning.*

Combing Theorem 4.2 and 4.3(2) and assume μ_ℓ^∞ converges to some limit measure, then the empirical measures of the SVGD particles weakly converge to the target distribution, i.e., $\hat{\mu}_\ell^n \Rightarrow \nu_p$, as $\ell \to \infty,\ n \to \infty$.

4.2. Continuous Time Limit and Vlasov Process

Many properties can be easier understood as we take the continuous time limit, reducing our system to a partial differential equation (PDE) of the particle densities (or measures).

To be specific, taking infinitesimal step size $\epsilon \to 0$ in (12), then one can show that the evolution of the density q formally reduces to the following nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_t(x) = -\nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_t,p}(x) q_t(x)). \tag{14}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_t,p}(x) = \boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_{q_t},p}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{x'\sim q_t}[\mathcal{A}^{x'}_p k(x,x')]$. This PDE is nonlinear because the velocity filed $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_t,p}(x)$ depends on the solution q_t through the drift term $\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_t,p}$. See Appendix for the derivation.

Similar to the case of Φ_p, one may view (14) as a measure-value PDE that incorporates empirical measures as weak solutions. Take any test function h and integrate on the both sides of (14):

$$\int \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(x) q_t(x) \mathrm{d}x = -\int h(x) \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_t,p}(x) q_t(x)) \mathrm{d}x,$$

Denote by μ_t the measure of density q_t. Using integration by parts on the right side to "shift" the derivative operator to h, we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_t}[h] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t}[\nabla h^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_t,p}], \tag{15}$$

which does not require derivative on μ_t. A set of measure $\{\mu_t\}$ is called the weak solution of (14) if it satifies (15).

Using results in Fokker-Planck equation, the measure process (14)-(15) can be translated to an ordinary differential equation on random particles $\{x_t\}$ whose distribution is μ_t:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{d}x_t = \boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_t,p}(x_t)\mathrm{d}t, \ \ \forall i = 1,\dots,n, \\ &\text{where } \mu_t \text{ is the law of random variable } x_t, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where x_0 is a random variable with distribution μ_0. Here the velocity field depends on the distribution of the particle at the current time.

In particular, if we initialize (15) using an empirical measure $\hat{\mu}^n_0$ of a set of finite particles $\{x^i_0\}^n_{i=1}$, (16) reduces to the following continuos time limit of n-particle SVGD dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{d}x^i_t = \boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\hat{\mu}^n_t,p}(x^i_t)\mathrm{d}t, \ \ \forall i = 1,\dots,n, \\ &\text{where } \hat{\mu}^n_t(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \delta(x - x^i_t)\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\{\hat{\mu}^n_t\}$ is a weak solution of (14)-(15), parallel to (11) in the discrete time case. (16) can be viewed as the large sample limit ($n \to \infty$) of (17).

The process (14)-(17) is a type of *Vlasov processes* (Braun & Hepp, 1977; Vlasov, 1938), which are (deterministic) interacting particle processes of the particles interacting with each other though the dependency on their "mean field" μ_t (or $\hat{\mu}^n_t$), and have found important applications in physics, biology and many other areas. There is a vast literature on theories and applications of interacting particles systems in general, and we only refer to Spohn (2012); Del Moral (2013) as examples.

The convergence properties of the continuous time process is in principle parallel to the discrete time ones that we discussed. For example, variants of Theorem 4.2 for continuous time can be found in Spohn (2012, Chapter 5). Parallel to Theorem 4.3, we can establish the following result that is of central importance to our gradient flow perspective:

Theorem 4.4. *Assume* $\{\mu_t\}$ *satisfies* (15) *and* $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_0 \,||\, \nu_p) < \infty$*, then*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p) = -\mathbb{D}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)^2. \tag{18}$$

Remark *This result suggests a path integration formula:*

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu_0 \,||\, \nu_p) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{D}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)^2 \mathrm{d}t,$$

which may be useful for constructing new algorithms for estimating KL divergence or the normalization constant.

4.3. Discussion on the Convergence Rate

(18) suggests that KL divergence $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)$ decreases monotonically. It requires further conditions to establish a fast convergence speed on $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)$. Fully satisfying results regarding this has not been obtained, but we present some tentative derivations to invite discussions.

One approach to obtain a convergence bound is to establish some inequality of form

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p)^m \le \alpha \mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p)^2, \tag{19}$$

for some positive number α and m, because if so we have $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p) \le -\alpha^{-1}\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)^m$, from which an upper bound of $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)$ can be established.

Denote by $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ with respect to ν (or the ratio of their density functions). The following result is based on directly applying the variational representation (5) of Stein discrepancy $\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p)$.

Theorem 4.5. *For any two probabilistic measures* μ *and* ν_p*, let* $\alpha_{\mu,\nu_p} = ||\log(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu_p})||_{\mathcal{H}^+_p}$*, and we have*

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p) + \mathrm{KL}(\nu_p \,||\, \mu) \le \alpha_{\mu,\nu_p}\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu_p).$$

Let $\alpha = \max_{0\le t\le\infty}\{\alpha_{\mu_t,\nu_p}\}$ and assume $\alpha < \infty$; combining Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p) \le -\frac{1}{\alpha^2}\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)^2,$$

which implies that $\mathrm{KL}(q_t \,||\, p)$ decays with an $O(1/t)$ rate:

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p) \le \frac{\alpha^2}{t + \alpha^2/\mathrm{KL}(\mu_0 \,||\, \nu_p)}.$$

Here the assumption of $\alpha_{\mu_t,\nu_p} \le \alpha < \infty$ is crucial; it require that the trajectory $\{\mu_t\}$ is "nice" enough such that the log Radon-Nikodym derivative (or log density ratio) $\log(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu_p})$ stays within a ball of $\mathcal{H}_p^+ = \mathcal{H}_p \oplus \mathbb{R}$. This seems to be a reasonable assumption, since we can initialize μ_0 sufficiently nice to be in $\mathcal{H}_p^+$, which is dense in L_p^2 as shown in Theorem 3.3, and α_{μ_t,ν_p} may not explode since $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p) \to 0$. But more rigorous results are needed.

Remark *If we can establish* (19) *with* $m = 1$*, or* $\alpha_{\mu_t,\nu_p} \le \beta \mathbb{D}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)$ *with some* $\beta < \infty$*, then we can obtain that* $\mathrm{KL}(\mu_t \,||\, \nu_p)$ *decays at an exponential rate using a similar derivation. These conditions are much stronger than* $\alpha < \infty$*. Nevertheless, we find that KL divergence often decays exponentially in practice and efforts are needed to establish the result under better assumptions.*

4.4. Gradient Flow, Optimal Transport, Geometry

We develop a geometric view for the Vlasov process in Section 4.2, interpreting it as a gradient flow for minimizing the KL divergence functional, defined on a new type of optimal transport metric on the space of density functions induced by Stein operator.

We focus on the set of "nice" densities q paired with Stein operator $\mathcal{T}_q$, acting on a generic Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ which may vary for different q. This provides a highly generic framework: SVGD corresponds to the case when we use a fixed RKHS $\mathcal{H}$; if we take $\mathcal{H}$ to the q-weighted L_q^2, it reduces to a geometric view for Langevin dynamics developed by Otto (2001); see also Ollivier et al. (2014).

To develop the intuition, consider a density q and its nearby density q' obtained by applying transform $\boldsymbol{T}(x) = x + \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)\mathrm{d}t$ on $x \sim q$ with infinitesimal $\mathrm{d}t$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$. From Fokker-Planck equation $\partial q/\partial t = -\nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi} q) = q\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we have

$$q' = q - q\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\phi}\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \log q' = \log q - \mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\phi}\mathrm{d}t, \tag{20}$$

In other words, the Stein operator $\mathcal{T}_q$ (resp. $q\mathcal{T}_q$) translates a $\boldsymbol{\phi}$-perturbation on the random variable to the corresponding change on the log-density (resp. density). This fact plays a central role in our development.

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_q$ (resp. $q\mathcal{H}_q$) the space of functions of form $\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\phi}$ (resp. $q\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\phi}$) with $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$. Equivalently, $q\mathcal{H}_q$ is the space of functions of form qf where $f \in \mathcal{H}_q$. For each $f \in \mathcal{H}_q$, we can identify an unique element $\boldsymbol{\psi}_f \in \mathcal{H}$ that have minimum $||\cdot||_{\mathcal{H}}$ norm in the set of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ that satisfies $\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\psi} = f$, that is,

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}\in\mathcal{H}} \big\{||\boldsymbol{\psi}||_{\mathcal{H}} \quad s.t. \quad \mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\psi} = f\big\},$$

where $\mathcal{T}_q\boldsymbol{\psi} = f$ is called Stein equation. This allows us to define inner products on $\mathcal{H}_q$ and $q\mathcal{H}_q$ using the inner product on $\mathcal{H}$:

$$\langle f_1\ f_2\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_q} \coloneqq \langle qf_1,\ qf_2\rangle_{q\mathcal{H}_q} \coloneqq \langle \boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f_1},\ \boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \tag{21}$$

If $\mathcal{H}$ is a RKHS with kernel $k(x,x')$, then $\mathcal{H}_q$ and $q\mathcal{H}_q$ are both RKHS; the reproducing kernel of $\mathcal{H}_q$ is $\kappa_p(x,x')$ in (7), and correspondingly, the kernel of $q\mathcal{H}_q$ is $q(x)\kappa_p(x,x')q(x')$.

Now for q and $q' = q + qf\mathrm{d}t$, $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}_q$, the $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}$ can be viewed as the "optimal" transforms, in the sense of having minimum $||\cdot||_{\mathcal{H}}$ norm, that transports q to q' via $\boldsymbol{T}(x) = x + \boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}(x)\mathrm{d}t$. It is therefore natural to define a notion of distance between q and $q' = q + qf\mathrm{d}t$ via,

$$\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q,\ q') \coloneqq ||\boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}||_{\mathcal{H}}\mathrm{d}t$$

From (20) and (21), this is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q,\ q') = ||q - q'||_{q\mathcal{H}_q}\mathrm{d}t = ||\log q' - \log q||_{\mathcal{H}_q}\mathrm{d}t.$$

Under this definition, we can see that the infinitesimal neighborhood $\{q' \colon \mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q,\ q') \le \mathrm{d}t\}$ of q, consists of densities (resp. log-densities) of form

$$\begin{aligned} q' &= q + g\mathrm{d}t, \quad \forall g \in q\mathcal{H}_q,\ \ ||g||_{q\mathcal{H}_q} \le 1 \\ \log q' &= \log q + f\mathrm{d}t, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}_q,\ \ ||f||_{\mathcal{H}_q} \le 1. \end{aligned}$$

Geometrically, this means that $q\mathcal{H}_q$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_q$) can be viewed as the tangent space around density q (resp. log-density $\log q$). Their related inner product $\langle\cdot,\ \cdot\rangle_{q\mathcal{H}_q}$ (resp. $\langle\cdot,\ \cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_q}$) forms a Riemannian metric structure that corresponds to $\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q,\ q')$.

This also induces a geodesic distance that corresponds to a general, $\mathcal{H}$-dependent form of optimal transport metric between distributions. Consider two densities p and q that can be transformed from one to the other with functions in $\mathcal{H}$, in the sense that there exists a curve of velocity fields $\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_t \colon \boldsymbol{\phi}_t \in \mathcal{H},\ \ t \in [0,1]\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$, that transforms $x_0 \sim q$ to $x_1 \sim p$ via $\mathrm{d}x_t = \boldsymbol{\phi}_t(x)\mathrm{d}t$. Equivalently, there exists a curve of densities $\{\rho_t \colon t \in [0,1]\}$ such that

$$\partial_t\rho_t = -\nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi}_t\rho), \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0 = q,\ \ \rho_1 = p.$$

It is therefore natural to define a geodesic distance between q and p via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q,\ p) = \inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\phi}_t\}} \Big\{ &\int_0^1 ||\boldsymbol{\phi}_t||_{\mathcal{H}}dt, \\ s.t. \quad &\partial_t\rho_t = -\nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi}_t\rho_t), \quad \rho_0 = p,\ \ \rho_1 = q\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We call $\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(p,q)$ an $\mathcal{H}$-Wasserstein (or optimal transport) distance between p and q, in connection with the typical 2-Wasserstein distance, which can be viewed as a special case of (22) by taking $\mathcal{H}$ to be $L_{\rho_t}^2$, replacing the cost with $\int ||\phi_t||_{L_{\rho_t}^2} dt$; 2-Wasserstein distance is widely known to

relate Langevin dynamics as we discuss more in Section 4.5 (e.g., Otto, 2001; Villani, 2008).

Now for a given functional $F(q)$, this metric structure induced a notion of functional covariant gradient: the covariant gradient $\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} F(q)$ of $F(q)$ is a functional that maps q to an element in the tangent space $q\mathcal{H}_q$ of q, and satisfies

$$F(q + f\text{d}t) = F(q) + \langle \text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} F(q),\ f\text{d}t \rangle_{q\mathcal{H}_q}, \quad (23)$$

for any f in the tangent space $q\mathcal{H}_q$.

Theorem 4.6. *Following definition (23), the gradient of the KL divergence functional $F(q) = \text{KL}(q \,||\, p)$ is*

$$\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{KL}(q \,||\, p) = \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q,p} q).$$

Therefore, the SVGD related Valsov equation (14) is a gradient flow of KL divergence under metric $\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$\frac{\text{d}q_t}{\text{d}t} = -\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{KL}(q_t \,||\, p).$$

In addition, $||\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{KL}(q \,||\, p)||_{q\mathcal{H}_q} = \mathbb{D}(q \,||\, p)$.

Remark *We can also definite the functional gradient via*

$$\text{grad}_{\mathcal{H}} F(q) \propto \underset{f:\, ||f||_{q\mathcal{H}_q} \le 1}{\arg\max} \left\{ \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \frac{F(q + \epsilon f) - F(q)}{\mathbb{W}_{\mathcal{H}}(q + \epsilon f,\ q)} \right\},$$

which specifies the steepest ascent direction of $F(q)$ (with unit norm). The result in Theorem (4.6) is consistent with this definition.

4.5. Comparison with Langevin Dynamics

The theory of SVGD is parallel to that of Langevin dynamics in many perspectives, but with importance differences. We discuss their similarities and differences in this section.

Langevin dynamics works by iterative updates of form

$$x_{\ell+1} \leftarrow x_\ell + \epsilon \nabla \log p(x_\ell) + \sqrt{2\epsilon}\xi_\ell, \quad \xi_\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where a *single* particle $\{x_\ell\}$ moves along the gradient direction, perturbed with a random Gaussian noise that plays the role of enforcing the diversity to match the variation in p (which is accounted by the deterministic repulsive force in SVGD). Taking the continuous time limit ($\epsilon \to 0$), We obtain a Ito stochastic differential equation,

$$\text{d}x_t = -\nabla \log p(x_t)\text{d}t + \sqrt{2\beta^{-1}}\text{d}W_t,$$

where W_t is a standard Brownian motion, and x_0 is a random variable with initial distribution q_0. Standard results show that the density q_t of random variable x_t is governed by the following Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t q_t = -\nabla \cdot (q_t \nabla \log p) + \Delta q_t, \quad (24)$$

following which the KL divergence to p also decreases monotonically, with a rate that equals Fisher divergence:

$$\frac{\text{d}}{\text{d}t} \text{KL}(q_t \,||\, p) = -\mathbb{F}(q_t, p), \quad (25)$$

where $\mathbb{F}(q, p) = ||\nabla \log(q/p)||^2_{L^2_q}$. This result is parallel to Theorem 4.4, and the role of square Stein discrepancy (and RKHS $\mathcal{H}$) is replaced by Fisher divergence (and L^2_q). In fact, Fisher divergence can be viewed as a Stein discrepancy defined with $\mathcal{H} = L^2_q$ in (1) (Liu et al., 2016).

In general, it is suggestive to view SVGD and Langevin as applying Stein operator on RKHS $\mathcal{H}$ and L^2_q space, respectively. For example, analogous to Theorem 4.6, it is well known that (24) can be also treated as a gradient flow of the KL functional $\text{KL}(q \,||\, p)$, under the 2-Wasserstein metric $\mathbb{W}_2(q,\ p)$, with a geometric interpretation (Otto, 2001) that can be obtained by replacing $\mathcal{H}$ with L^2_q in Section 4.4.

The main advantage of using RKHS is that it allows tractable computation of the optimal transport direction; this is not case when using L^2_q and as a result Langevin dynamics requires a random diffusion term in order to form a proper approximation. But because RKHS is smaller than L^2_q, Langevin dynamics can obtain better asymptotic properties. For example, an exponential decay of $\text{KL}(q_t \,||\, p)$ in (24) can be established by combining (25) with the so called logarithmic Sobolev inequality $\text{KL}(q \,||\, p) \le \beta^{-1}\mathbb{F}(q \,||\, p)$, which holds for *arbitrary* q and *strongly log-concave* p with $-\nabla^2 \log p \succeq \beta I$ for some $\beta > 0$ (see. e.g., Ollivier et al., 2014). Unfortunately, it is harder to establish similar bounds of form (19) for SVGD with kernels, because kernelized Stein discrepancy is weaker than (upper bounded by) Fisher divergence (Liu et al., 2016, Theorem 5.1). In fact, an obvious negative result is that (19) can not hold for arbitrary μ since if μ is not absolutely continuous w.r.t. ν we have $\text{KL}(\mu \,||\, \nu) = \infty$ and $\mathbb{F}(\mu \,||\, \nu) = \infty$ while $\mathbb{D}(\mu \,||\, \nu)$ remains to be finite. Therefore, conditions that ensures μ is sufficiently regular, similar to what we had in Theorem 4.5, are needed.

On the other side, we should point out that weaker asymptotic properties do not suggest worse practical performance, because of at least two reasons:

1) Because we can arbitrarily scale the time in the continuous time systems, their convergence speed does not directly translate to practical speed, which, instead, should mostly depend on the maximum step-size that we can stably discretize the system. Because SVGD uses a deterministic discretization to the Vlasov process, it allows us to use larger step-sizes in practice, while Langevin dynamics has been known to be sensitive to the choice of step-sizes and one often has to use much smaller step-sizes.

2) A highly attractive practical property of SVGD is that it exactly reduces to gradient ascent for finding the mode

of $\log p$ (that is, maximum a posteriori (MAP)) when using only a single particle ($n = 1$). This makes SVGD perform well even with a very small number of particles, since MAP often already provides sufficiently good results in many practical cases. In contrast, Monte Carlo methods tend to perform worse with small n and do not fully leverage the powerful of each individual particles due to the randomness it relies on. Note that this nice property of SVGD can not be explained using any these asymptotic methods and new methods that can take this into account are highly desirable.

5. Conclusion

We studied the theoretical properties of Stein variational gradient descent, and also provide a number of theoretical results on Stein operator and Stein discrepancy in general. Many components of the analysis provides new insights in both theoretical and practical aspects. For example, the new metric structure can be used to solve other learning problems by leveraging its computational tractability.

References

Braun, W and Hepp, K. The Vlasov dynamics and its fluctuations in the 1/n limit of interacting classical particles. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 56(2): 101–113, 1977.

Chen, Yutian, Welling, Max, and Smola, Alex. Super-samples from kernel herding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.3472*, 2012.

Chwialkowski, Kacper, Strathmann, Heiko, and Gretton, Arthur. A kernel test of goodness-of-fit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02964*, 2016.

Dai, Bo, He, Niao, Dai, Hanjun, and Song, Le. Provable Bayesian inference via particle mirror descent. In *AISTATS*, 2016.

Del Moral, Pierre. *Mean field simulation for Monte Carlo integration*. CRC Press, 2013.

Dick, Josef, Kuo, Frances Y, and Sloan, Ian H. High-dimensional integration: the quasi-monte carlo way. *Acta Numerica*, 22:133–288, 2013.

Gorham, Jack and Mackey, Lester. Measuring sample quality with Stein's method. In *NIPS*, pp. 226–234, 2015.

Gorham, Jack, Duncan, Andrew B, Vollmer, Sebastian J, and Mackey, Lester. Measuring sample quality with diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.06972*, 2016.

Hundertmark, Dirk, Meyries, Martin, Machinek, Lars, and Schnaubelt, Roland. Operator semigroups and dispersive equations (lecture notes). 2013. URL https://isem.math.kit.edu/images/b/b3/Isem16_final.pdf.

Johnstone, Iain. On inadmissibility of some unbiased estimates of loss. *Statistical Decision Theory and Related Topics*, 4(1):361–379, 1988.

Liu, Qiang and Wang, Dilin. Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose bayesian inference algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.04471*, 2016.

Liu, Qiang, Lee, Jason D, and Jordan, Michael I. A kernelized Stein discrepancy for goodness-of-fit tests and model evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.03253*, 2016.

Oates, Chris J, Cockayne, Jon, Briol, François-Xavier, and Girolami, Mark. Convergence rates for a class of estimators based on Stein's identity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.03220*, 2016.

Oates, Chris J, Girolami, Mark, and Chopin, Nicolas. Control functionals for Monte Carlo integration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 2017.

Ollivier, Yann, Pajot, Hervé, and Villani, Cédric. *Optimal Transport: Theory and Applications*, volume 413. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Otto, Felix. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. 2001.

Spohn, Herbert. *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

Stein, Charles. Approximate computation of expectations. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 7:i–164, 1986.

Stein, Charles M. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *The annals of Statistics*, pp. 1135–1151, 1981.

Villani, Cédric. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

Vlasov, Anatoly Alexandrovich. On vibration properties of electron gas. *J. Exp. Theor. Phys*, 8(3):291, 1938.

Wainwright, Martin J, Jordan, Michael I, et al. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 1(1–2): 1–305, 2008.

A. Richness of Steinalized Space

A.1. Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof. First, because $q\boldsymbol{\phi} \in (W^1)^d$, we have by the definition of weak derivative:

$$\mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)] = -\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)], \qquad \forall h \in C_c^\infty.$$

For $h \in \mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $h_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty$ such that

$$||h - h_\epsilon||_{W^1_{2,p}} \leq \epsilon,$$

that is,

$$||h - h_\epsilon||_{L^2_p} + ||\nabla h - \nabla h_\epsilon||_{(L^2_p)^d} \leq \epsilon,$$

Then for $h \in \mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&||\mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)] + \mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)]||_2 \\
&\leq ||\mathbb{E}_p[(h(x) - h_\epsilon(x))\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)]||_2 + ||\mathbb{E}_p[(\nabla h(x) - \nabla h_\epsilon(x))^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)]||_2 \\
&\leq ||h - h_\epsilon||_{L^2_p} ||\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}||_{L^2_p} + ||\nabla h - \nabla h_\epsilon||_{(L^2_p)^d} ||\boldsymbol{\phi}||_{(L^2_p)^d} \\
&\leq \epsilon(||\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)||_{L^2_p} + ||\boldsymbol{\phi}||_{(L^2_p)^d})
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\epsilon \to 0$ gives the result. □

A.2. Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. Because $\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathring{W}^1_{2,p} \subseteq W^1_{2,p} \subseteq L^2_p, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq (L^2_p)^d$, the condition in Lemma 3.2 is satisfied and we can take $M = \mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ in Lemma A.1.

In order to use Lemma A.1, we just need to verify that $\mathcal{H} \cap \nabla\mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ is dense in $(\mathring{W}^1_{2,p})^d$ under $||\cdot||_{(L^2_p)^d}$ norm. To see this, note that because C_c^∞ is dense in $\mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ under $||\cdot||_{W^2_p}$ norm, we have that ∇C_c^∞ is dense in $\nabla\mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ under $||\cdot||_{(L^2_p)^d}$ norm. But $\nabla C_c^\infty \subseteq (C_c^\infty)^d$, so $(C_c^\infty)^d$ is dense in $(\mathring{W}^1_{2,p})^d$ under $||\cdot||_{L^2_p}$. This allows us to establish that $\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathring{W}^1_{2,p})^d$ is dense in $(\mathring{W}^1_{2,p})^d$ because $\mathcal{H} \cap (C_c^\infty)^d$ is assumed to be dense in $(C_c^\infty)^d$.

Therefore, by Lemma A.1, $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is dense in $\mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$ under $||\cdot||_{L^2_p}$ norm. This allows us to further claim that $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is dense in L^2_p, because $\mathcal{H}_p^+ \subseteq \mathring{W}^1_{2,p} \subseteq L^2_p$ and we know that C_c^∞ (and hence $\mathring{W}^1_{2,p}$) is dense in L^2_p under $||\cdot||_{L^2_p}$ norm.

□

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear space of $d \times 1$ vector-valued measurable functions. Let $\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}$ be an operator defined on $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}$, and M is a subspace of functions h in $W^1_{2,p}$ that satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)] = -\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)], \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H},$$

that is,

$$M \subset \left\{h \in W^1_{2,\mu} \colon \mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)] = -\mathbb{E}_p[\nabla h(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}(x)], \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}\right\}.$$

Denote by ∇M the space of functions formed by ∇h for $h \in M$, It is obvious that $M \subseteq L^2_p$ and and $\nabla M \subseteq (L^2_p)^d$.

Define

$$\mathcal{H}_p^+ = \{\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi} + b \colon \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}, \quad b \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Assume

1 $\mathcal{H}_p^+ \subseteq M$;

2. $\mathcal{H} \cap \nabla M$ is dense in ∇M in terms of $||\cdot||_{(L^2_p)^d}$ norm.

Then $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is dense in $\mathcal{M}$ in terms of $||\cdot||_{L^2_p}$ norm.

Proof. Because $\mathcal{H}_p^+ \subseteq M \subseteq L_p^2$, if $\mathcal{H}_p^+$ is not dense in M in terms of $||\cdot||_{L_p^2}$ norm, there must exists a non-zero $h \in M$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_p[h(x)] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}] = 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Because $h \in M$, by the definition of M, we have

$$\langle \nabla h(x), \ \boldsymbol{\phi} \rangle_{(L_p^2)^d} = \mathbb{E}_q[\nabla h(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}] = -\mathbb{E}_p[h(x)\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}] = 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Because $\mathcal{H}$ is dense in ∇M and $\nabla h \in \nabla M$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\boldsymbol{\phi}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$||\nabla h - \boldsymbol{\phi}_\epsilon||^2_{(L_p^2)^d} \leq \epsilon,$$

which gives

$$||\nabla h||^2_{(L_p^2)^d} \leq ||\nabla h||^2_{(L_p^2)^d} \ + \ ||\boldsymbol{\phi}_\epsilon||^2_{(L_p^2)^d} \leq \epsilon,$$

Taking ϵ to be arbitrarily small, we have $\nabla h = 0$, a.e. This together with $\mathbb{E}_p[h] = 0$ implies that $h = 0$, a.e. □

A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof. $\mathbb{D}(\mu \ || \ \nu_p) = 0$ implies that $\mathbb{E}_\mu f = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}_p^+$. It is enough to further show that $\mathbb{E}_\mu f = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f$ for all bounded, continuous functions (which is a subset of L_p^2). From Theorem 3.3, for any bounded continuous function f, there exists a sequence of $\{f_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_p^+$ such that $||f_n - f||_{L_p^2} \to 0$, and this means that there exists a subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}$ that converges to f almost everywhere (under measure ν_p). Because f and f_{n_k} are continuous, this means that f_{n_k} converges to f pointwisely. Because f_{n_k} are bounded, Lebesgue's dominant convergence theorem implies $\mathbb{E}_\mu f_{n_k} \to \mathbb{E}_\mu f$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f_{n_k} \to \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f$.

Because $f_{n_k} \in \mathcal{H}_p^+$ and $\mathbb{D}(\mu \ || \ \nu_p) = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu f_{n_k} = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f_{n_k}, \forall k$. This implies $\mathbb{E}_\mu f = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p} f$ which concludes the proof. □

B. Density Evolution of SVGD Dynamics

B.1. Proof of Lemma 4.1

Proof. Because $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) = x + \epsilon \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \mu}[\boldsymbol{g}(x, x')]$, where $\boldsymbol{g}(x, x') = \mathcal{A}_p^{x'} k(x, x')$, we have

$$||\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}||_{\text{Lip}} = \max_{x \neq y} \frac{\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) - \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(y)}{||x - y||_2} = \max_{x \neq y} \frac{x - y + \epsilon \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \mu}[\boldsymbol{g}(x, x') - \boldsymbol{g}(y, x')]}{||x - y||_2} \leq 1 + \epsilon ||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\text{Lip}}, \tag{B.1}$$

and for $\forall \ x$,

$$||\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) - \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}(x)||_2 = \epsilon ||\mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \mu} \boldsymbol{g}(x, x') - \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \nu} \boldsymbol{g}(x, x')||_2 \leq \epsilon ||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\text{BL}} \ \text{BL}(\mu, \nu). \tag{B.2}$$

For any h with $||h||_{\text{BL}} = \max(||h||_\infty, \ ||h||_{\text{Lip}}) \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathbb{E}_{\Phi_p(\mu)}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{\Phi_p(\nu)}[h]\right| \\
&= \left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}]\right| \\
&\leq \left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}]\right| \ + \ \left|\mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}]\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

We just need to bound these two terms. For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}]\right| &\leq ||h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}||_{\text{BL}} \ \text{BL}(\mu, \ \nu) \\
&\leq \max\left(||h||_\infty, \ ||h||_{\text{Lip}} ||\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}||_{\text{Lip}}\right) \text{BL}(\mu, \ \nu) \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon ||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\text{Lip}}) \text{BL}(\mu, \ \nu), \qquad \text{//by Equatoin B.1.}
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}]\right| &\leq \max_x \left|h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) - h \circ \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}(x)\right| \\
&\leq ||h||_{\text{Lip}} \max_x ||\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu,p}(x) - \boldsymbol{T}_{\nu,p}(x)||_2 \\
&\leq \epsilon ||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\text{BL}} \ \text{BL}(\mu, \ \nu), \qquad \text{//by Equation B.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{BL}(\Phi_p(\mu),\ \Phi_p(\nu)) \leq (1+\epsilon||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathrm{Lip}} + \epsilon||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathrm{BL}})\ \mathrm{BL}(\mu,\ \nu) \leq (1+2\epsilon||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathrm{BL}})\ \mathrm{BL}(\mu,\ \nu).$$

□

B.2. Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof. Denote by $\mu_\ell = \mu_\ell^\infty$ and $M = ||\nabla \log p||_{\mathrm{Lip}}$ for notation convenience.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(\mu_{\ell+1} \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) &= \mathrm{KL}(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) \\
&= \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}^{-1}\nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) \\
&= -\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu_\ell}[\log p(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)) + \log\det(\nabla \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)) - \log p(x)].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x) = x + \epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}$. We have the follow version of Taylor approximation:

$$\log p(x) - \log p(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)) \leq -\epsilon\nabla_x \log p(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p} \ + \ \frac{1}{2}M\epsilon^2||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}||_2^2. \tag{B.3}$$

This is because, defining $x_s = x + s\epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log p(x) - \log p(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)) &= -\int_0^1 \nabla_s \log p(x_s)\mathrm{d}s \\
&= -\int_0^1 \nabla_x \log p(x_s)^\top(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p})\ \mathrm{d}s \\
&= -\epsilon\nabla_x \log p(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p} \ - \ \int_0^1 (\nabla_x \log p(x_s) - \nabla_x \log p(x))^\top(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p})\mathrm{d}s \\
&\leq -\epsilon\nabla_x \log p(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p} \ + \ M\epsilon^2||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}||_2^2\int_0^1 s\mathrm{d}s \\
&= -\epsilon\nabla_x \log p(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p} \ + \ \frac{1}{2}M\epsilon^2||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}||_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fundamental theorem of calculus, which holds for weakly differentiable functions (**?**, Theorem 3.60, page 77). In addition, by the concavity of $\log\det(\cdot)$, we have

$$\log\det(\nabla\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)) \leq \mathrm{tr}(\nabla\boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}(x) - I) = \epsilon\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}. \tag{B.4}$$

(B.3) and (B.4) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(\mu_{\ell+1} \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) &\leq -\epsilon\mathbb{E}_{\mu_\ell}[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}] + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}M\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu_\ell}[||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}(x)||_2^2] \\
&\leq -\epsilon\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p)^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}M\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu_\ell}[k(x,x)]\cdot||\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{\mu_\ell,p}||_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\
&= -\epsilon\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p)^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}M\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu_\ell}[k(x,x)]\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p)^2 \\
&\leq -\epsilon\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p)^2(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}M\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu_\ell}[k(x,x)]).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, take $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{M\max_x k(x,x)}$, we have

$$\mathrm{KL}(\mu_{\ell+1} \,||\, \nu_p) - \mathrm{KL}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{2}\mathbb{D}(\mu_\ell \,||\, \nu_p)^2.$$

□

B.3. Deriving the Nonlinear Fokker-Planck Equation (14)

Proof. Here we give a quick, informal proof. Recall that μ_ℓ is the measure of density q_ℓ. We write $\boldsymbol{T}_\ell = \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu_\ell,p}$ for convenience. Since when the step-size ϵ is small, we have $\boldsymbol{T}_\ell - 1(x) = x - \epsilon\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x) + o(\epsilon)$. From (12), we have by change of variables formula and Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{\ell+1}(x) &= q_\ell(\boldsymbol{T}_\ell^{-1}(x))\det(\nabla_x \boldsymbol{T}_\ell^{-1}(x)) \\
&= q_\ell(x - \epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x))\det(I - \epsilon\nabla_x\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x)) + o(\epsilon) \\
&= q_\ell(x) - \epsilon\sum_i \nabla_{x_i} q_\ell(x)\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x) - \epsilon q_\ell(x)\cdot\mathrm{tr}(\nabla_x\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x)) + o(\epsilon) \\
&= q_\ell(x) - \epsilon\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x)q_\ell(x)) + o(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{q_{\ell+1}(x) - q_\ell(x)}{\epsilon} = -\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q_\ell,p}(x)q_\ell(x)) + o(\epsilon).$$

Taking $\epsilon \to 0$ gives the result. □

B.4. Proof of Theorem 4.5

Proof. It is the direct result of $\mathbb{D}(\mu,\ \nu_p) = \max_{f\in\mathcal{H}_p}\{\mathbb{E}_\mu f \quad s.t. \quad ||f||_{\mathcal{H}_p} \le 1\}$ and $\mathrm{KL}(\mu\ ||\ \nu_p) + \mathrm{KL}(\nu_p\ ||\ \mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^*]$, where $f^* = \log(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu_p}) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu_p}\log(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu_p})$. □

B.5. Proof of Theorem 4.6

Proof. Since $q' = q + qf\mathrm{d}t$ is equivalent to transforming the variable by $\boldsymbol{T}(x) = x + \boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}\mathrm{d}t$, the corresponding change on KL divergence is

$$\begin{aligned}
F(q + qf\mathrm{d}t) &= F(q) + \mathbb{E}_q[\mathcal{T}_p\boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}]\mathrm{d}t \\
&= F(q) + \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q,p},\ \boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\mathrm{d}t \\
&= F(q) + \langle\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q,p}q),\ \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{q,f}q)\rangle_{q\mathcal{H}_q}\mathrm{d}t \\
&= F(q) + \langle\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q,p}q),\ qf\rangle_{q\mathcal{H}_q}\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}^*_{q,p}q)$ is the covariant functional gradient. □